



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/697,685	10/29/2003	Laura Lynn Heilman	9398	9815

27752 7590 12/15/2004

THE PROCTER & GAMBLE COMPANY
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DIVISION
WINTON HILL TECHNICAL CENTER - BOX 161
6110 CENTER HILL AVENUE
CINCINNATI, OH 45224

EXAMINER

O MALLEY, KATHRYN S

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3749

DATE MAILED: 12/15/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/697,685

Applicant(s)

HEILMAN ET AL.

Examiner

Kathryn S. O'Malley

Art Unit

3749

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 October 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments regarding the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) in view of Staub et al. have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
2. Applicant argues that, "Staub et al. does not disclose either expressly or inherently a fabric article treating device having an interior housing located inside of a fabric article drying appliance." Examiner respectfully disagrees and again directs Applicant's attention to drum 14 which is an interior housing located inside of fabric article drying appliance 10.
3. Applicant's arguments, filed 4 October 2004, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 13 and 23 in view of Staub et al. and Pletcher et al. have been fully considered and are persuasive. However, after further consideration, the rejection is upheld.
4. Applicant has correctly argued that Pletcher et al. does not expressly teach utilizing an electrically charged liquid to treat fabric. However, while Applicant argues that this makes the combination of Pletcher et al. and Staub et al. unobvious, Examiner disagrees. Please note the new statement of motivation regarding Staub et al. in view of Pletcher et al.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

Art Unit: 3749

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1-4, 6-13, and 14-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent 5,980,583 to Staub et al.
3. Staub et al. teaches a fabric treatment device and method of its use comprising nozzle 52 in the door 18 of rotating drum 14 in communication, via conduit 70, with outer housings 60, 72, 64, and 74, which house a wrinkle releaser to be sprayed onto fabric inside the drum 14 through nozzle 52. The apparatus further has heat sensors and controls substantially independent of the controls of the drying device. Note column 5, lines 1-63 and Figure 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Staub et al. as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of US Patent 4,891,890 to Church.
6. Staub et al. does not teach the fabric treatment device having its own power source. Church teaches a similar fabric treatment device comprising its own power source. Note column 3, lines 9-22 and Figure 1. As Church teaches that a treatment device having its own power source can operate completely independently of the

Art Unit: 3749

laundry dryer, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the treatment device of Staub et al. with the power source of Church.

7. Claims 13 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Staub et al. as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of US Patent 6,474,563 to Pletcher et al.

8. Staub et al. does not teach electrically charging the wrinkle releaser. Pletcher et al. teaches electrically charging a "home care liquid formulation," wherein the formulation can retain an electric charge for a sufficient time period for contacting a target. Note column 1, lines 27-34. While Pletcher et al. does not expressly suggest charging a wrinkle releaser, it is deemed by this examiner that a wrinkle releaser falls within the category of a "home care liquid formulation." Therefore, as Pletcher et al. teaches that electrically charging a home care formulation leads to greater attraction between the target and the formulation and, therefore, more efficient treatment, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the fabric treatment method and apparatus of Staub et al. with the electrically charged formulation of Pletcher et al.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kathryn S. O'Malley whose telephone number is (703)308-2844. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:30-5:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ira Lazarus can be reached on (703)308-1935. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

KSO


DENISE L. ESQUIVEL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700